

Reconstruction of Group Multiplication Tables by Quadrangle Criterion

PETR VOJTĚCHOVSKÝ

Department of Mathematics, Iowa State University, 400 Carver Hall, Ames,
IA, 50011, U.S.A.

Abstract

For $n > 3$, every $n \times n$ partial Cayley matrix with at most $n - 1$ holes can be reconstructed by quadrangle criterion. Moreover, the holes can be filled in given order. Without additional assumptions, this is the best possible result. Reconstruction of other types of multiplication tables is discussed.

1. Introduction

Let us get started by explaining exactly what we mean by reconstruction of multiplication tables. There are at least two approaches in the literature, so it is not out of place to introduce the basic definitions here.

Let $M = (m_{i,j})$ be an $n \times n$ matrix. It is important to distinguish the entries of M from the cells they occupy. For that matter, if $c = (i, j)$ is the cell formed by the intersection of row i and column j , let $v(c)$ be the entry in c , namely $m_{i,j}$.

The quadruple (a, b, c, d) of cells is called *quadrangle* if a, b, c, d are (all four) corners of a non-degenerate rectangular block such that a, c lie on one of the diagonals of the block. A block is *non-degenerate* if it has at least two rows and two columns. There are 8 ways to write down every quadrangle, and we will identify them.

A matrix M is said to satisfy the *quadrangle criterion* if $v(c_4) = v(d_4)$ whenever (c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) and (d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4) are two quadrangles satisfying $v(c_i) = v(d_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. This criterion was introduced by M. Frolov [5], as remarked by Dénes and Keedwell [1, p. 19].

Following [2], we say that M is a *Cayley matrix* if it is a Latin square satisfying the quadrangle criterion.

An $n \times n$ matrix M with a headline and sideline is a (*group*) *multiplication table*, or *Cayley table*, if there is a group $(G, \cdot)$ and two enumerations $g_1, \dots, g_n$ and $h_1, \dots, h_n$ of its elements such that the rows of M are labeled by $g_1, \dots, g_n$, the columns of M by $h_1, \dots, h_n$ (in this order) and

$$m_{i,j} = g_i \cdot h_j \quad (1)$$

holds for every i, j , $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

The relation between Cayley tables and Cayley matrices is well-known (cf. [1, Theorem 1.2.1]). Every Cayley table gives rise to a Cayley matrix when the sideline and headline are deleted. Conversely, given a Cayley matrix M , any row and any column can be chosen as a sideline and headline, respectively, to turn M into a Cayley table. In other words, a matrix M is a Cayley matrix if and only if (1) holds for some group $(G, \cdot)$ and two enumerations $g_1, \dots, g_n$ and $h_1, \dots, h_n$ of elements of G .

A Cayley matrix M will be called *balanced* here, if $g_i = h_i$ for every i , $1 \leq i \leq n$. (We prefer the adjective *balanced* to *symmetrical* because a balanced Cayley matrix M is symmetrical as a matrix if and only if it is associated with a commutative group.) Similarly, we can speak of *balanced Cayley tables*.

There are other *types* of multiplication tables. For instance, Zassenhaus introduced normal Cayley tables, and Tamari defined generalized normal Cayley tables (cf. [1, p. 21]).

We are concerned with reconstructions of partial Cayley tables and matrices. The process of reconstruction is not well-defined unless we specify:

- (a) the type of multiplication table,
- (b) the data available for the reconstruction,
- (c) the method of reconstruction.

The procedure then goes as follows. Let G be a group, and M one of its multiplication tables of type t . Let us delete a few entries in M . The resulting partial table P will be referred to as a *partial multiplication table*, and the empty cells will be called *holes*. Our goal is to fill in the holes of P using only the allowed data and methods so that P turns into a multiplication table of type t again. When this process, called *reconstruction*, always yields M , we say that M is *reconstructable* from P .

Here are a few comments on items (a), (b) and (c). Naturally, we assume that P is part of the data available for reconstruction. However, when M has no headline and sideline, it can happen that P does not contain all elements of G . Then, strictly speaking, M cannot be reconstructed from P unless we include the elements of G as part of the data. Some authors take this for granted, of course. As far as the methods are concerned, one can always use the most general of them—the *brute force* method. (Fill in P at random. Check whether you have obtained a multiplication table of type t . Do it in all possible ways.) Needless to say, such an approach is merely of theoretical interest, and it is therefore essential to specify the methods. Also, the parallelism of the reconstruction is of practical importance.

The crucial question is: *Given a group multiplication table M of type t , how many holes can there be in P so that M is reconstructable from P using only the allowed data and methods?*

Note that reconstructable means *uniquely* reconstructable, by our definition.

Dénes proved [1, Section 3.2] that, with two exceptions for $n = 4$ and 6 , every Cayley matrix with at most $2n - 1$ holes can be reconstructed

1			
	a	b	c

2			
	a	b	c
	b	c	a
	c	a	b

3			
	a	b	c
	c	a	b
	b	c	a

4			
	a		

5			
	a	c	b
	c	b	a
	b	a	c

6	a	b	c
a	a		
c			
b			

Figure 1: Partial Cayley Matrices and Tables

provided all the group elements are known. He only used the quadrangle criterion and the fact that every Cayley matrix is a Latin square, but he was not interested in the order in which the holes can be filled. His proof was made more precise by Frische [4].

Drápal investigated Cayley tables and proved [3] that every such table is reconstructable if $n \geq 51$ and there are not more than about $6n$ holes (see [3] for precise statement). The case when n is prime was resolved in [6].

In all three situations, the estimate on the number of holes cannot be improved in general.

The author is not aware of any result concerning the reconstruction of balanced Cayley matrices. Apparently, the problem of reconstruction for Cayley tables is equivalent to that of balanced Cayley tables.

It is easy to see that the reconstructions of Cayley matrices, balanced Cayley matrices, and Cayley tables pose three distinct problems. We can illustrate this already for $n = 3$. To avoid trivialities, assume that the group elements are known and call them a, b, c . The partial Cayley matrix 1 in Figure 1 cannot be reconstructed. There are two possibilities to complete 1 into a Cayley matrix (2 and 3). However, when we know that 1 is a partial balanced Cayley matrix, it must be symmetrical, and therefore 2 is the only solution. Matrix 4 cannot be reconstructed as a balanced Cayley matrix (both 2 and 5 are solutions). However, when we label the rows and columns of 4 as in 6, say, the element a becomes the neutral element, and thus 6 can only be completed into 3 as a Cayley table with the given headline and sideline.

In this short note we prove:

THEOREM 1.1: *Let $n > 3$. Every Cayley matrix of order n with at most $n - 1$ holes can be reconstructed by quadrangle criterion. Moreover, the order in which the holes are to be filled can be chosen in advance.*

We also argue that this is, in a sense, the best possible result.

2. The Reconstruction

Let M be a Cayley matrix associated with some n -element group G , and let P be a part of M . The following obvious Lemma tells us how to apply the quadrangle criterion during reconstruction.

LEMMA 2.1: *Let (c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) , (d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4) be two quadrangles in P and assume that $v(c_i) = v(d_i)$ holds for $i = 1, 2, 3$, that c_4 is not a hole, and that d_4 is a hole. Then the hole d_4 must be filled with $v(c_4)$ in order to complete P into a Cayley matrix.*

Therefore, we are done with Theorem 1.1 as soon as we prove:

PROPOSITION 2.1: *Let $n > 3$, and assume that there are at most $n-1$ holes in P . Then for every hole d_4 there are two quadrangles (c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) and (d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4) such that $v(c_i) = v(d_i)$ holds for every $i = 1, 2, 3$, and such that the only hole among the c_i 's and d_i 's is d_4 .*

Equivalently, we can state Proposition 2.1 as follows:

PROPOSITION 2.2: *Assume that G is a group of order $n > 3$, and let $T \subseteq G \times G$ be of cardinality at most $n-1$. Then for every tuple $(g_1, h_1) \in T$ there are elements $g_2, h_2, g'_1, g'_2, h'_1, h'_2$ of G such that*

- (i) $g_1 \neq g_2, h_1 \neq h_2, g'_1 \neq g'_2, h'_1 \neq h'_2$,
- (ii) $g_i \cdot h_j = g'_i \cdot h'_j$ for every $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$,
- (iii) $\{(g_i, h_j), (g'_i, h'_j); 1 \leq i, j \leq 2\} \cap T = \{(g_1, h_1)\}$.

We now prove Proposition 2.1. Suppose that $n > 3$ and that there are at most $n-1$ holes in P .

LEMMA 2.2: *Assume that (a, b, c, d) is a quadrangle satisfying*

- (C1) d is a hole,
- (C2) a, b, c are not holes,
- (C3) $v(a) \neq v(c), v(b) \neq v(d)$ in M .

Then the hole d can be filled by quadrangle criterion.

Proof: There are exactly n quadrangles $Q_i = (a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i)$ in M with $v(a_i) = v(a), v(b_i) = v(b), v(c_i) = v(c)$, and $v(d_i) = v(d)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Because $v(a), v(b), v(c), v(d)$ are four different elements of G , no two quadrangles Q_i, Q_j have a corner in common. Since there are at most $n-1$ holes in P , one of the quadrangles Q_i is complete, say Q_k . Apply Lemma 2.1 to Q_k and (a, b, c, d) . $\square$

Pick a hole d in P . Without loss of generality, we may assume that $d = (n, n)$. We try to find a quadrangle (a, b, c, d) satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 2.2. As we will see later, this is possible whenever $n > 4$. The case $n = 4$ requires special treatment.

From now on, let all quadrangles $Q = (a, b, c, d)$ be written in such a way that a is the bottom-left corner, b the top-left corner, and c the top-right corner of Q . Define

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \{c; c \text{ a hole in } P\}, \\ T_0 &= \{c \in T; c = (i, j), 1 \leq i, j < n\}, \\ T_x &= \{c \in T; c = (i, n), 1 \leq i < n\}, \\ T_y &= \{c \in T; c = (n, j), 1 \leq j < n\}, \end{aligned}$$

and let $t = |T|$, $t_0 = |T_0|$, $t_x = |T_x|$, $t_y = |T_y|$. We have

$$t_0 + t_x + t_y + 1 = t \leq n - 1, \quad (2)$$

because the sets T_0 , T_x and T_y are disjoint and d does not belong to $T_0 \cup T_x \cup T_y$.

Given $a = (n, j)$ with $j < n$ there are either $n - 2$ or $n - 3$ quadrangles $(a, ?, ?, d)$ satisfying (C1) and (C3). (There are $n - 2$ of them if and only if there is a quadrangle (a, b, c, d) with $v(a) = v(c)$, $v(b) = v(d)$.) Therefore, there are at least $(n - 1)(n - 3)$ quadrangles $(?, ?, ?, d)$ satisfying (C1) and (C3). (This estimate cannot be improved in general. To see this, consider the standard Cayley table of any cyclic group C_n of odd order $n > 1$.)

LEMMA 2.3: *If $t_x + t_y \leq 1$, there is at least one quadrangle $(?, ?, ?, d)$ satisfying (C1), (C2) and (C3).*

Proof: There are at least $(n - 1)(n - 3)$ quadrangles $(?, ?, ?, d)$ satisfying (C1) and (C3). Every hole from T_x affects at most $n - 2$ of them, and so does every hole from T_y . Every hole from T_0 affects at most one such quadrangle. Thus, there are at least

$$\tau = (n - 1)(n - 3) - t_0 - (t_x + t_y)(n - 2)$$

quadrangles satisfying (C1), (C2), (C3).

When $t_x + t_y = 0$, we have $\tau \geq (n - 1)(n - 3) - (n - 2) = n^2 - 5n + 5 > 0$, for $n > 3$.

Similarly, when $t_x + t_y = 1$, we have $t_0 \leq n - 3$, and consequently $\tau \geq (n - 1)(n - 3) - (n - 3) - (n - 2) = n^2 - 6n + 8$. This is positive when $n > 4$.

Without loss of generality, assume that $t_x = 1$, $t_y = 0$, $n = 4$. Delete the unique row $i < n$ of M for which (i, n) is a hole to obtain an $(n - 1) \times n$ block B . For every $a = (n, j)$ with $j < n$, there is at least one quadrangle (a, b, c, d) such that $b, c \in B$ and $v(a) \neq v(c)$. Moreover, when $v(n, j) = v(i, n)$, there is another such quadrangle. Hence, there are at least $3 + 1 = 4$ such quadrangles. At most 2 of them satisfy $v(b) = v(d)$ because $v(d)$ appears 3 times in B . Hence, there are at least $4 - 2 = 2$ quadrangles $(?, ?, ?, d)$ satisfying (C1) and (C3). Since $t_0 \leq 1$, we are done. $\square$

When $t_0 \geq n - 3$, we have $t_x + t_y \leq 1$, and Lemma 2.3 applies.

When $0 < t_0 < n - 3$, we have $t_x + t_y \leq n - 3$. Then τ from the proof of Lemma 2.3 is greater than or equal to $n - 3 - t_0 > 0$.

Finally, assume that $t_0 = 0$. We could change our point of view and conclude that at least one hole of P can be filled but, remember, we want to fill d .

Let $t_y < n - 3$. There is at least one full cell c in the n th column of P . Therefore, we have at least 3 quadrangles $(?, ?, c, d)$ satisfying (C1) and (C2). The condition (C3) can exclude at most 2 of them. Similarly when $t_x < n - 3$.

When both t_x and t_y are bigger than or equal to $n - 3$, (2) implies that $2(n - 3) \leq t_x + t_y \leq n - 2$. This means that $n = 4$, $t_x, t_y \geq 1$, $t_0 = 0$. It is enough to solve the case $t_x = t_y = 1$. Let c_1, c_2 be the two full cells in the n th column of P . Similarly, introduce a_1, a_2 in the n th row of P . Let B be the 3×3 top-left block of M . The value $v(d)$ appears in B . Pick k, l such that $1 \leq k, l \leq 3$ and $v(k, l) = v(d)$. Then there are $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $v(c_i)$ is within the k th row of B and $v(b_j)$ within the l th column of B . Because there is no hole in B , we have found two quadrangles satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 2.1.

This completes the proof of Proposition 2.1 and Theorem 1.1.

3. Discussion and Acknowledgements

The bound $n > 3$ cannot be improved. Consider the Cayley matrix

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 1 & 2 \\ \boxed{1} & 2 & 0 \\ 2 & \boxed{0} & 1 \end{array}$$

of C_3 , and observe that none of the holes (framed cells) can be filled by quadrangle criterion.

Lemma 2.2 cannot be applied to every Cayley matrix of order 4. Look, for example, at the Cayley matrix

$$\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & \boxed{0} \\ 2 & 3 & 0 & 1 \\ 3 & \boxed{0} & 1 & \boxed{2} \end{array}$$

of C_4 .

Because there are at most $n - 1$ holes in P , we do not need to add the names of elements of G as part of the data available for reconstruction. However, even with this data added, the bound $n - 1$ cannot be improved to n . Consider a Cayley matrix M with one row deleted. Then it is impossible to reconstruct M just by quadrangle criterion. It would be interesting to know whether this is the only pathological situation for $n > 4$.

The author would like to thank one of the referees for his/her useful comments on reconstruction in general, and for the formulation of Proposition 2.1 as a group-theoretical result (cf. Proposition 2.2).

References

- [1]J. Dénes and A. D. Keedwell, *Latin Squares and their Applications*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, Hungary, 1974.
- [2]D. Donovan, S. Oates-Williams and C. E. Praeger, *On the distance between distinct group Latin squares*, J. Combin. Des. **5** (1997), no. 4, 235–248.
- [3]A. Drápal, How far apart can the group multiplication tables be?, *European J. Combin.* **13** (1992), no. 5, 335–343.
- [4]S. Frische, Lateinische Quadrate, Diploma Thesis, Vienna, 1988.
- [5]M. Frolov, *Recherches sur les permutations carrées*, J. Math. Spéc. (3) 4(1890), 8–11
- [6]P. Vojtěchovský, Distances of Groups of Prime Order, *Contributions to General Algebra* **11**, Proceedings for the Olomouc Workshop '98 on General Algebra, edited by I. Chajda, G. Eigenthaler, R. Halaš. W. B. Müller, H.-J. Vogel, J. Zedník, Verlag Johannes Heyn, Klagensfurt, 1999.